

REMARKS

Basis for the amendment to claim 1 may be found at page 6, lines 4-26 and at page 5, lines 7-13. Basis for the amendment to claim 2 may be found at page 6 lines 4-20.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Bryant (081). The Examiner states that Bryant discloses a method of locating a linear defect on a photographic element including exposing a region of the element to create a developable latent image, which is substantially uniform across the imaging width of the element, processing the latent image, sampling the density signal and analyzing the sample density for the presence of deviations aligned with the length of the element to locate a defect. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Bryant is not performing a similar inspection system to that of the claimed invention. Bryant is looking for repetitive anomalies that could cause flickering. He is not looking for widthwise variation but looking at variation in exposure density along the length of the film. In contrast, the instantly claimed invention analyzes in the widthwise direction for uniformity of exposure. By analyzing in the widthwise direction linear defects can be located as points of nonuniformity. In contrast, Bryant is analyzing for uniformity differences between sections of the film not portions in the widthwise direction. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 3, 5-8, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bryant as applied to claims 1 and 16 and further in view of Reem et al. (944). The Examiner states that Reem teaches that it is known to form a multiplicity of exposure levels on a photographic element and that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Bryant et al. to include exposing a multitude of exposure levels as taught by Reem et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As discussed above Bryant does not analyze for widthwise variations that would indicate linear defects. Reem is not seeking to detect defects in film, but is measuring density to determine the gamma correction to be carried out so as to that use the film for forming desirable images. There are no

teachings in Reem which would lead one to modify Bryant to detect linear anomalies by widthwise analysis of exposures. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 12-15, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bryant as applied to claims 1 and 16 and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (522). The Examiner states that Kobayashi et al. discloses a thermal film imaging process and that the invention could be applied to such a process as thermal film is well-known. Nevertheless, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kobayashi et al. of the method of locating a linear defect in a photographic element as instantly claimed in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that the combination of Bryant and Kobayashi et al. does not disclose or suggest the instantly claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bryant as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Prigent. The Examiner states that Prigent teaches that it is known to average the samples of the density signal and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention to modify the sampling of the density signal disclose by Bryant to include averaging as taught by Prigent. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Prigent is dealing with the measurement of thickness variation over a length of film substrate. There is no disclosure or suggestion of crosswise variations. Therefore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the combination of Bryant and Prigent which would lead one to the invention of claim 1 or 4. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bryant (081) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Factor (217). Factor is sensing raw material to determine if it should be discarded. Factor is not dealing with exposed material. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Factor that a digital image be adjusted utilizing information from defect detection. Therefore, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the process of claim 1 much less the process of claim 9 where image detection is utilized to adjust a digital image.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paul A. Leipold", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-722-5023
Facsimile: 585-477-1148